



Interview with Brother Ahmad Iman Ali regarding the General elections in Kenya - Part Two

Summary of the film

In the first part of this interview, Brother Ahmad was asked questions relating to democracy and the ruling of the Muslims participating in the democratic process. In the second part of the interview, the Sheikh was asked about some of the main *shubuhaat* that are used by the evil scholars in order to justify participating in the democratic process.

The part of the interview also consists of five questions, and they are as follows:

Q1) Brother Ahmad, the first *shubha* that we want to discuss is that some scholars use the story of Prophet Yusuf (A.S.) working for the king of Misr as an evidence to justify the permissibility of democracy and the parliament. According to the Sharia law are their claims valid?

Summary of the brother's answer:-

- Firstly we should know that the Sharia of the Prophets before the Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W) does not become our sharia. Our sharia has abrogated all the other sharias that have come before it.
- Instead of looking at other Sharias we have to look at what the Sharia of the Prophet (S.A.W) says concerning democracy and the nusus of the Quran clearly point out that democracy is a form of Kufr.

- Secondly let's look at the story of Yusuf itself
 - Prophet Yusuf (A.S) was jailed because he refused to do an **evil deed** (fahisha) and at that time he was a slave and did not have authority. How then can we claim then that he did **Kufr** when he had gained authority after he came out of jail?
 - Furthermore, while he was in jail and in a state of weakness he did daa'wa of tawheed.

يَا صَاحِبِ السِّجْنِ أَرْيَا بَ مُتَفَرِّقُونَ خَيْرٌ أَمِ اللَّهُ الْوَاحِدُ الْقَهَّارُ (39) مَا تَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِهِ إِلَّا أَسْمَاءٌ سَمَّيْتُمُوهَا أَنْتُمْ وَآبَاؤُكُمْ مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ بِهَا مِنْ سُلْطَانٍ إِنْ الْحُكْمُ إِلَّا لِلَّهِ أَمَرَ أَلَّا تَعْبُدُوا إِلَّا إِيَّاهُ ذَلِكَ الدِّينُ الْقَيِّمُ وَلَكِنَّ أَكْثَرَ النَّاسِ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ (40)

- Therefore if he did Da'awa of tawheed while in jail and in a state of weakness, is it logical that he will abandon it when he gained authority and power?
- Thus, Nabi Yusuf was using the rule of Allah, and this is clearly shown when he used the Hukm of Allah to get hold of his brother rather than use the rule of the king of Misr.
- Apart from that, later on Nabi Yaaqub came and lived with Yusuf in Misr. Is it logical for both these prophets to be in one place without ruling by the law of Allah?
- Lastly, in the end of Nabi Yusuf's story, he raised his parents on the throne and they prostrated for him. Imagine that today, those who worship the graves come and say that we are prostrating for the graves because this was something that was there in the sharia before our sharia. Without doubt, this is not a valid daleel because our sharia does not allow for prostrating for other than Allah. In the previous sharias it was permissible to prostate from others out of respect but in our sharia we can only prostate to Allah.
- Thus this proves that the Story of Yusuf cannot be used as a daleel to legitimize Democracy.

Q2) Brother Ahmed Apart from the Story of Nabi yusuf, some scholars to justify the permissibility of democracy say that after Najashi had accepted Islam, he did not rule by the Sharia and he remained in that state until he passed away. Despite that the Prophet praised him, called him a righteous slave and prayed on him and ordered his companions to pray on him. What does the sharia state concerning this claim?

Summary of the brother's answer:-

- This shubha of Najashi does not have any ground. The fact that the prophet (S.A.W) prayed for him and praised him to be righteous save is in itself points out that he did indeed rule by the law of Allah. Because it is not possible for the Prophet to give one this kind of Tazkiyya if he had a flaw in using the rule of Allah. Apart from that, we are asking those who use this calim them to prove to us with a sahih daleel that Najashi did not rule by Allah's law. And the fact is that there is no daleel that shows that Najashi did not rule by Allah's law after he accepted Islam.
- Therefore, it is just an empty claim, and the fact that he Prophet praised him confirms that he did indeed rule by the Sharia, based upon what had reached him. This is because Najashi had passed away before the Sharia law had been revealed completely. So he ruled by the Sharia of Allah based on what had reached him while he was alive.
- Furthermore, there is a sahih narration that after he had accepted Islam he send a group of people to Madina with a letter to the Prophet (s.a.w). In that letter, he mentioned to the Prophet that he had accepted Islam and he was ready to follow the orders of the Prophet. He mentioned that if the prophet ordered him to make hijra he would leave his Kingdom, go to Madinah and serve the Prophet. If he was ready to sacrifice all he had and was ready to serve the Prophet is it then logical to say that he favored not no rule by the law of Allah.

Q3) Brother Ahmad, apart from that some Muslims claim that democracy and shura are the same and they are related. Is it true that these two things are the same?

Summary of the brother's reply

- Comparing Democracy to Shura is like comparing Iman to Kufr. These are two different things that oppose each other and cannot coincide at all.
- Firstly, Shura is a command from Allah (S.W.T). Allah commanded his Prophet : **“وَشَاوِرْهُمْ فِي الْأَمْرِ”** and when explaining the traits of the believers Allah said **“وَأَمْرُهُمْ شُورَى بَيْنَهُمْ”**. On the other side, where in the Quran has Allah commanded us to follow democracy? Therefore, Shura is a command from Allah while democracy is not.
- Secondly, whoever takes part in shura does so with the intention of pleasing Allah because he knows that it is an Ibada. On the other hand, those who take part in Democracy whether it be by

voting, or by entering the parliament, or by becoming senators and governors do so to please other human beings and to fulfil their worldly desires.

- Thirdly, all of those who sit down and participate in shura agree and recognize that : **”إِنِ الْحُكْمُ إِلَّا لِلَّهِ”** that the rule is that of Allah alone. But as for those who participate in the sittings of democracy they do not recognize the rule of Allah rather they recognize the rule that is mentioned in the constitution.
- Fourthly, democracy has no borders and limits but Shura has its limits. People cannot come together for shura and make Haraam halal or make halal haram. Rather they are governed by the boundaries of the sharia. Nevertheless, in democracy they can do *tahriim* and *tahlill* based upon their whims and desires.
- Fifthly, in democracy anybody can take part as long as he got most of the votes. Therefore, it will include a kafir, a mujrim, an evil person, a crook etc. that is why we see that the Kenyan parliament is filled with drug dealers and a bunch of thieves. Is this what we can call Shura? On the other had in shura only *Ahlul Ilm wal Khibra* can take part and not just any person.
- Sixth, matters that are discussed in Shura are matters that do not have a clear and explicit evidence in the Sharia. However, in democracy they can discuss everything even things that are the sole rights of Allah like that of *tahlill* and *Tahriim*.
- Seven, in Shura the criterion is what Allah and His messenger have said but in democracy the criterion is based on numbers. If the majority want alcohol to be sold everywhere then it will be sold, if majority want prostitution to continue then it will continue.
- Therefore, this are the differences between Democracy and Shura and this shows that they are two different things.

Q4) Brother Ahmed, we would also like to know whether the events of Hilf al-Fudhul could be used as an evidence to justify the permissibility of democracy as claimed by some.

Summary of the brother's reply

- The main aim of Hilf-al Fudhul was an agreement that was reached at so that the oppressed can regain their rights. And this is among the aims of Islam i.e. to eradicate dhulm and the first dhulm that Islam eradicates is the Dhulm of Shirk. That is why Allah said **“إِنَّ الشِّرْكَ لَظُلْمٌ عَظِيمٌ”**.
- Thus, those who are participating in democracy, instead of eradicating dhulm they are plunging people further into the greatest dhulm that is shirk.

Q5) Brother Ahmad, in the end of this interview we would request you to give the viewers a nasia or a short message.

Summary of the brother's reply

- “I am leaving my brothers with one single verse as a nasiha.....and that verse has the solution for the oppression and lowliness that we are living in whether it is the lowliness democracy, or the oppression that we face at the hands of the Kuffar. The solution for all that is one only. Allah say : **“وَقَاتِلُوهُمْ حَتَّى لَا تَكُونَ فِتْنَةٌ وَيَكُونَ الدِّينُ لِلَّهِ”**
- “To the youth I say; you now have an opportunity. The old in the society wasted their youth running after democracy and they ended up getting no benefit..... Therefore I advise the youth not to waste their time running after democracy, rather use your time to build your hereafter. Perform hijra, join the Mujahideen so that you we can return the glory of Islam.”

The End

Global Islamic Media Front